arXiv:1212.6617v1 [math.GR] 29 Dec 2012

ACCUMULATION POINTS OF INFINITE COXETER GROUPS OF RANK 3

AKIHIRO HIGASHITANI, RYOSUKE MINEYAMA, AND NORIHIRO NAKASHIMA

Abstract. In this paper, we investigate the limit set of normalized roots of infinite Coxeter groups of rank 3. Moreover, we obtain that the set of such accumulation points coinsides with the closure of the orbit of one point of normalized limit roots.

1. Introduction

The theory of Coxeter groups has been developed from not only combinatorial but also geometrical aspects. One of the most fundamental and important objects associated with Coxeter groups is root systems. In the case of a finite Coxeter group, which is nothing but a finite reflection group, its roots correspond to normal vectors of hyperplanes defining Euclidean reflections. In the case of an infinite Coxeter group, if it is an affine reflection group, which is a small class of infinite Coxeter groups, then its roots also correspond to normal vectors. However, little investigation on roots has been done for the case of general infinite Coxeter groups. This paper is devoted to analyzing roots of all infinite Coxeter groups of rank 3. Concretely, we solve [3, Conjecture 3.9] for rank 3 Coxeter groups.

Hohlweg, Labbé and Ripoll proposed in [3, Conjecture 3.9] that the distribution of accumulation points of roots of infinite Coxeter groups can be described as some appropriate set of points. In fact, they showed that such points lie in the projected isotropic cone $\widehat{Q}$. From geometrical viewpoints, as is well known in the theory of discrete groups of Möbius transformation, to study accumulation points is nothing but to study the interaction between ergodic theory and discrete groups. That has rich geometrical aspects and the theory stands as a well developed branch of mathematical reserch. However, in order to establish that theory, the hyperbolicity of the space plays a crucial role. On the other hand, the Coxeter groups act on the flat space. So one of our motivation is to inspect an analogue for the Coxeter groups, and to disclose the difference between flat and hyperbolic from accumulation points.

Recall that W is a *Coxeter group* of rank n with the generating set S if W is generated by the set $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_n\}$ subject only to the relations $(s_i s_j)^{m_{ij}} = 1$, where $m_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}_{>1} \cup \{\infty\}$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ and $m_{ii} = 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. More precisely, we say that the pair (W, S) is a *Coxeter system*. We refer the reader to [4] for the introduction to Coxeter groups.

For a Coxeter system (W, S) of rank n, let V be a real vector space with its orhonormal basis $\Delta = \{\alpha_s : s \in S\}$ and we define a symmetric bilinear form on V

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 20F55, 51F15; Secondary 05E15.
Keywords: Coxeter group, roots, orbits, accumulation points.
The first author is supported by JSPS Research Fellowship for Young Scientists.

by setting

$$B(\alpha_i, \alpha_j) \begin{cases} = -\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{m_{ij}}\right) & \text{if } m_{ij} < \infty, \\ \leq -1 & \text{if } m_{ij} = \infty \end{cases}$$

for $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$, where $\alpha_{s_i} = \alpha_i$. Classically, $B(\alpha_i, \alpha_j) = -1$ if $m_{ij} = \infty$, but throughout this paper, we allow its value to be any real number less than or equal to -1. This definition derives from [3] and this is available in some situation. Given $\alpha \in V$ such that $B(\alpha, \alpha) \neq 0$, s_α denotes the map $s_\alpha : V \to V$ by

$$s_\alpha(v) = v - 2\frac{B(\alpha, v)}{B(\alpha, \alpha)}\alpha \quad \text{for any } v \in V,$$

which is said to be a *B-reflection*. Then Δ is linearly independent and satisfies that

(i) for all $\alpha, \beta \in \Delta$ with $\alpha \neq \beta$, one has

$$B(\alpha, \beta) \in (-\infty, -1] \cup \left\{-\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{k}\right) : k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>2}\right\};$$

(ii) for all $\alpha \in \Delta$, one has $B(\alpha, \alpha) = 1$.

Such a set Δ is called a *simple system* and its elements are *simple roots* of W. The Coxeter group W acts on V associated with its generating set S as composition of B-reflections $\{s_\alpha : \alpha \in \Delta\}$ genetrated by simple roots. The *root system* Φ of W is defined to be the orbit of Δ under the action of W and its elements are called its *roots*. The pair (Φ, Δ) is said to be a *based root system* in (V, B).

Given $v \in V$, we define $|v|_1$ by $\sum_{i=1}^n v_i$ if $v = \sum_{i=1}^n v_i\alpha_i$. Note that a function $|\cdot|_1 : V \to \mathbb{R}$ is actually a norm in the set of vectors having nonnegative coefficients. Let $V_i = \{v \in V : |v|_1 = i\}$. For $v \in V \setminus V_0$, we write $\widehat{v}$ for the "normalized" vector $\frac{v}{|v|_1} \in V_1$. Also for a set $A \subset V \setminus V_0$, we write $\widehat{A}$ for the set of all $\widehat{a}$ with $a \in A$.

Our main interest is the distribution of limit points of roots of an infinite Coxeter group. In the case of a finite Coxeter group, its root system Φ is finite. When a Coxeter group is infinite, Φ is also infinite. So the classical tools developed in the Euclidean geometry are no longer usable.

On the other hand, in a recent paper [3], some tools to deal with roots of infinite Coxeter groups were established as a first step of the study of them. Our motivation to organize this paper is to contribute further studies of the paper [3].

As is known in [3, Theorem 2.7 (i)], the norm of a positive root always deverges as its depth tends to infinity. Thus, in order to investigate asymptotical behaviors of positive roots, it seems to be needed to normalize them in some sence, which we will use $|\cdot|_1$.

Let $q(v) = B(v, v)$ for $v \in V$, $Q = \{v \in V : q(v) = 0\}$ and E a set of limit points of normalized roots $\widehat{\rho}$ for $\rho \in \Phi$. It was proved in [3, Theorem 2.7] that $E \subset \widehat{Q}$ and also proposed the following.

Conjecture 1.1 ([3, Conjecture 3.9])**.** *Given an infinite Coxeter group W of rank n, the following assertions hold:*

(i) *When $\widehat{Q} \subset \mathrm{conv}(\Delta)$, we have $E = \widehat{Q}$;*

(ii) *When $\widehat{Q} \not\subset \mathrm{conv}(\Delta)$, we have $E = \widehat{Q} \setminus (\bigcup_{i=1}^m W \cdot D_i)$, where $D_1, \ldots, D_m$ are connected components of $\widehat{Q}$ out of* $\mathrm{conv}(\Delta)$ *with $m \leq n$.*

In this paper, we prove this conjecture for the case of rank 3.

Theorem 1.2. *Work with the same notation as above. For an infinite Coxeter group of rank 3, we have the following:*

(a) *When* $\widehat{Q} \subset \mathrm{conv}(\Delta)$*, we have* $E = \widehat{Q}$*;*

(b) *When* $\widehat{Q} \not\subset \mathrm{conv}(\Delta)$*, we have* $E = \widehat{Q} \setminus (\bigcup_{i=1}^{m} W \cdot D_i)$*, where* $D_1, \dots, D_m$ *are connected components of* $\widehat{Q}$ *out of* $\mathrm{conv}(\Delta)$ *with* $1 \leq m \leq 3$*.*

Here $w \cdot x$ stands for the normalized action on V_1 for $w \in W$ and $x \in V_1$. See Section 2.

Remark 1.3. It is easy to calculate that the bilinear form B on V arising from a Coxeter group of rank 3 is either positive definite, positive semidefinite or has its signature $(2,1)$ (cf. [4, Section 6.7].) However, for a general Coxeter group of rank n, there exists a bilinear form whose signature is neither $(n,0)$, $(n-1,0)$ nor $(n-1,1)$. See Example 4.1.

Moreover, as a by-product of Theorem 1.2, we also obtain the following.

Corollary 1.4. *Let* W *be an infinite Coxeter group of rank 3. Fix* $x \in E$*. Then*

$$\overline{W \cdot x} = E.$$

This corollary follows immediately from the proofs of Theorem 1.2. See Section 3.

A brief overview of this paper is as follows. First, we will prepare some notations and collect fundamental facts in Section 2. Next, we will prove Theorem 1.2 in Section 3. At last, we will discuss Theorem 1.2 for the case of higher ranks in Section 4.

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank Yohei Komori and Hideki Miyachi for their helpful comments on Theorem 1.2.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we prepare some notations and lemmas for proving Theorem 1.2.

As noted before, W acts on V as composition of B-reflection. For analyzing asymptotical aspects of W (but we do not mention these aspects precisely here), we consider another action of W on V. For $v \in V$, we define $\widehat{v} = \frac{v}{|v|_1}$. The new action of $w \in W$ is given by

$$w \cdot v := \widehat{w(v)}, \quad v \in V,$$

where $w(v)$ denotes action of w defined before.

Let

$$V^+ := \{\ v \in V : \text{all the coefficients of } v \text{ are nonnegative}\ \} \text{ and}$$
$$V^- := \{\ v \in V : \text{all the coefficients of } v \text{ are nonpositive}\ \}.$$

It is known that based root system allows us to define positive roots $\Phi^+ := \Phi \cap V^+$, and then $\Phi = \Phi^+ \sqcup (-\Phi^+)$ (see, for instance, [1, 5]). In other words, all the roots are contained in $V^+ \cup V^-$.

Remark 2.1. Let us consider $v \in \widehat{Q} \cap \mathrm{conv}(\Delta)$. Then $|w(v)|_1$ is never equal to 0 for any $w \in W$, i.e., $v \notin W(V_0)$. On the contrary, suppose that there exist $w \in W$ and $v_0 \in V_0$ with $v_0 \neq 0$ such that $w(v_0) \in \widehat{Q} \cap \mathrm{conv}(\Delta)$. Then one has

$q(w(v_0)) = q(v_0) = 0$. Thus $v_0 \in Q$. However, since $Q \cap V_0$ includes only the origin, v_0 should be 0, a contradiction. Hence $\widehat{Q} \cap \mathrm{conv}(\Delta)$ never intersects with $W(V_0)$.

Lemma 2.2. *For $x, y \in Q \setminus \{0\}$, $B(x,y) = 0 \iff \widehat{x} = \widehat{y}$.*

Proof. If $\widehat{x} = \widehat{y}$, then there exists $c \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $x = cy$. By the definition of Q, it is obvious that $B(x,y) = 0$.

For the inverse, we suppose that there exist x and y belonging to $Q \setminus \{0\}$ with $B(x,y) = 0$. Then for any $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$q(ax + by) = a^2 q(x) + 2abB(x,y) + b^2 q(y) = 0.$$

This implies that Q includes a segment joining x and y. Obviously for any two vectors $x, y \in Q$, a segment joining them intersects Q at only x and y. Suppose that for any $t \in [0,1]$, $v(t) = (1-t)x + ty$ is in Q. This includes $v(t)$ must satisfy an equation $q(v(t)) = 0$. On the other hand, since this is a quadratic polynomial on t, it should have just two solutions $t = 0, 1$. This contradicts that $v(t)$ is always in Q for $t \in [0,1]$. ∎

Recall that in general, for a double indexed sequence $a_{n,i}$ having limits b_i as $n \to \infty$ for each i and c_n as $i \to \infty$ for each n, if the limit b_i (for the index n) is uniform on i and there exists $l = \lim_i b_i$, then there also exists $\lim_{n,i\to\infty} a_{n,i}$ which equals l, besides there exists $\lim_n c_n$ which equals $\lim_{n,i\to\infty} a_{n,i}$. Namely we can take a limit without caring about the order of indexes n and i when either sequences $(a_{n,i})_n$ or $(a_{n,i})_i$ converges uniformly;

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \lim_{i\to\infty} a_{n,i} = \lim_{i\to\infty} \lim_{n\to\infty} a_{n,i}.$$

For each $\rho \in \Phi$, let

$$\mathrm{dp}(\rho) = 1 + \min\{k : \rho = s_{\alpha_1} s_{\alpha_2} \cdots s_{\alpha_k}(\alpha_{k+1}) \text{ for } \alpha_i \in \Delta\}$$

be the depth of ρ.

Lemma 2.3. *Let w be an element in W with infinite order. Then for any $p \in E$, one has $\big||w^n(p)|_1\big| \longrightarrow \infty$ as $n \longrightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. For any injective sequence (ρ_i) in Φ^+ converging to p, there exists a subsequence ρ_{i_k} satisfying the following; ρ_{i_k} converges to p, injective and $\mathrm{dp}(\rho_{i_k}) \le \mathrm{dp}(\rho_{i_k+1})$. In fact, since ρ_i converges to p, the depth of ρ_i should go to infinity. We denote this subsequence (ρ_{i_k}) by (ρ_i) anew.

Note that for any $n, i \in \mathbb{N}$, $w^n(\rho_i)$ is in $V^+ \cup V^-$. Since our purpose is to show that the absolute value of $|w^n(p)|_1$ tends to ∞, it essentially suffices to show the case where all $w^n(\rho_i)$ are in V^+. Other cases are treated in almost the same way.

Let $a_{n,i} := \frac{1}{|w^n(\rho_i)|_1}$ for all $n, i \in \mathbb{N}$. The double indexed sequence $(a_{n,i})$ in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ has the limit 0 as $n \to \infty$ for each i and $\frac{1}{|w^n(p)|_1}$ as $i \to \infty$ for each n. We claim that $a_{n,i}$ converges as $n \to \infty$ uniformly. If this is true, then we have $\frac{1}{|w^n(p)|_1}$ tends to 0 as $n \to \infty$, and so the desired conclusion follows.

In V^+, $|\cdot|_1$ is actually a norm, so that is equivalent to the Euclidean norm $\|\cdot\|$. Because of this, it suffices to prove the claim for the Euclidean norm instead of $|\cdot|_1$. By [3, Lemma 2.10 (ii)], it holds that

$$\exists \lambda > 0, \forall \rho \in \Phi^+,\ \|\rho\|^2 \ge 1 + \lambda(\mathrm{dp}(\rho) - 1).$$

Fix $K \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ arbitrarily. Then the number of $(n,i) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ satisfying

$$1 + \lambda(\mathrm{dp}(w^n(\rho_i)) - 1) \leq K \tag{1}$$

is finite. In fact, for any fixed i satisfying $\mathrm{dp}(\rho_i) \leq \frac{K-1}{\lambda}$, the number of n such that $\mathrm{dp}(w^n(\rho_i)) \leq \frac{K-1}{\lambda}$ is finite. Furthermore, the same thing also holds for the claim given by exchanging the role of n for that of i whenever n satisfies that the word length of w^n is at most $\frac{K-1}{\lambda}$. So letting $N = \max\{n : (n,i) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ satisfying (1) $\}$, we see that if $n > N$ for any i, then $1+\lambda(\mathrm{dp}(w^n(\rho_i))-1) > K$. This shows that $\|w^n(\rho_i)\| \longrightarrow \infty$ as $n \longrightarrow \infty$ uniformly. ∎

Proposition 2.4. *Let $p \in E$. If a sequence $(w^n \cdot \rho)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ converges to p for some $w \in W$ and $\rho \in V_1$, then for any $q \in E$, $(w^n \cdot q)$ converges to p.*

Proof. We see that w has infinite order from assumption of the claim. Since $p = \lim_{n\to\infty} w^n \cdot \rho$, we have $w^n \cdot p = p$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $B(w^n(p), w^n(q)) = B(p,q)$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} B(p, w^n \cdot q) &= B\left(w^n \cdot p, w^n \cdot q\right) \\ &= B\left(\frac{w^n(p)}{|w^n(p)|_1}, \frac{w^n(q)}{|w^n(q)|_1}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{|w^n(p)|_1 |w^n(q)|_1} B(w^n(p), w^n(q)) \\ &= \frac{1}{|w^n(p)|_1 |w^n(q)|_1} B(p,q) \longrightarrow 0. \quad (n \to \infty) \end{aligned}$$

The last arrow follows from Lemma 2.3. Lemma 2.2 guarantees the conclusion. ∎

From now on, we consider the case of rank 3.

We define a metric on $\widehat{Q}$ by a bilinear form B. Let r be an arc in $\widehat{Q}$ joining x and y for $x, y \in \widehat{Q}$. The *length* $\ell_B(r)$ of r is defined by

$$\ell_B(r) = \inf_C \sum_{i=1}^{n} |B(x_{i-1}, x_i)|,$$

where the infimum is taken over all *chains* $C = \{x = x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_n = y\}$ on r with unbounded n.

Given $x, y \in \widehat{Q}$ with $x \neq y$, there are two arcs r_1, r_2 in $\widehat{Q}$ whose end points are x and y. We define

$$d_B(x,y) = \min\{\ell_B(r_1), \ell_B(r_2)\}.$$

We notice that $d_B : \widehat{Q} \times \widehat{Q} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a metric on $\widehat{Q}$. In fact, the nonnegativity and triangle inequality of d_B are obvious by definition (cf. [2, Section 1.24]). Moreover, since B is symmetric, the symmetry of d_B also follows immediately. In addition, Lemma 2.2 guarantees that $d_B(x,y) = 0$ for $x, y \in \widehat{Q}$ if and only if $x = y$. Thus $(\widehat{Q}, d_B)$ is a metric space. We remark that the identity map $id : (\widehat{Q}, d_E) \longrightarrow (\widehat{Q}, d_B)$ is continuous, where d_E is the Euclidean metric, so it is a homeomorphism.

The *interval* $[x,y]$ in $\widehat{Q}$ is the arc which attains $d_B(x,y)$. Let $L(x,y)$ (resp. $L[x,y]$) denote the *line* through x and y (resp. the *segment* joining x and y). Using this, we define a valuable idea given in [3]. That is, we say that $x \in \mathrm{conv}(\Delta) \cap \widehat{Q}$ is *visible* from $v \in \Delta$ if $L[x,v] \cap \widehat{Q} = \{x\}$. Given $z \in \Delta$, we call the set of all visible points from z in $\mathrm{conv}(\Delta)\cap\widehat{Q}$ *visible arc from* z. If there is no confusion, then we simply call it a visible arc.

We notice that there is no simple root from which all elements in $\widehat{Q}$ are visible. Note that for the case of rank 3, $\widehat{Q}\cap\mathrm{conv}(\Delta)$ is covered with three visible arcs from all the simple roots.

Let $H_{x,s}=\{v\in V : B(x,v)=s\}$ be the hyperplane. We also remark that for $x\in V$ and for any y lying between H_{x,s_1} and H_{x,s_2}, where $s_1\le s_2$, we have $s_1\le B(x,y)\le s_2$.

Lemma 2.5. *The following hold:*

(i) *Any visible arc from some simple root attains* $d_B(x,y)$ *between its end points* x *and* y.

(ii) *For* $\delta\in\Delta$, *let* $\rho,\rho'\in\widehat{Q}$ *be visible points from* δ *and* r *the arc attaining* $d_B(x,y)$. *Then one has*
$$\ell_B(r)\le\ell_B(s_\delta\cdot r). \tag{2}$$
Furthermore, if an arc $s_\delta\cdot r$ *is visible from some other simple root, then one has*
$$d_B(\rho,\rho')\le d_B(s_\delta\cdot\rho,s_\delta\cdot\rho').$$

(iii) *The equality of* (2) *holds if and only if one has either* $\rho=\rho'$ *or* $\{\rho,\rho'\}=\{s_\delta\cdot\rho,s_\delta\cdot\rho'\}$ *with* $\rho\ne\rho'$.

Proof. (i), (ii) We first claim that the image of some visible arc r from $\delta\in\Delta$ by s_δ is longer than r with respect to ℓ_B. By definition of ℓ_B and bijectivity of s_δ, it suffices to show that $|B(x,y)|\le|B(s_\delta\cdot x,s_\delta\cdot y)|$ for any $x,y\in r$.

From [3, Proposition 3.7 (i)], the visibility of r from δ implies that $B(\delta,x)\ge0$ and $B(\delta,y)\ge0$. Moreover, since $B(\delta,\delta)=1$, we have $B(\delta,x)\le1$ and $B(\delta,y)\le1$. Hence
$$||s_\delta(x)|_1|=||x-2B(\delta,x)\delta|_1|=|1-2B(\delta,x)|\le1.$$
Similarly, $||s_\delta(y)|_1|\le1$. Therefore,
$$|B(s_\delta\cdot x,s_\delta\cdot y)|=\frac{|B(s_\delta(x),s_\delta(y))|}{||s_\delta(x)|_1|\cdot||s_\delta(y)|_1|}=\frac{|B(x,y)|}{||s_\delta(x)|_1|\cdot||s_\delta(y)|_1|}\ge|B(x,y)|. \tag{3}$$
Next, from this argument, we observe that a visible arc r from $\delta\in\Delta$ attains the distance of its end points ρ and ρ'. In fact, the other arc joining ρ and ρ' must contain $s_\delta\cdot r$. More of this, if $s_\delta\cdot r$ is also a visible arc from some other $\delta'\in\Delta$, then this attains the distance between $s_\delta\cdot\rho$ and $s_\delta\cdot\rho'$, as desired.

(iii) The "if" part is clear.

Now, for any $\epsilon>0$, by the definition of ℓ_B, there is a chain $\{\rho=x_0,x_1,\dots,x_m=\rho'\}$ satisfying
$$(1+\epsilon)\ell_B(s_\delta\cdot\rho,s_\delta\cdot\rho')\ge\sum_{i=1}^{m}|B(s_\delta\cdot x_{i-1},s_\delta\cdot x_i)|. \tag{4}$$
Since for all $i\in\{1,2,\dots,m\}$ we have $|B(s_\delta\cdot x_{i-1},s_\delta\cdot x_i)|>|B(x_{i-1},x_i)|$ and $\sum_{i=1}^m|B(x_{i-1},x_i)|\ge\ell_B(\rho,\rho')$, there exists $i\in\{1,\dots,m\}$ such that
$$(1+\epsilon)|B(x_{i-1},x_i)|\ge|B(s_\delta\cdot x_{i-1},s_\delta\cdot x_i)|>|B(x_{i-1},x_i)|.$$

Furthermore, from $|B(s_\delta \cdot x_{i-1}, s_\delta \cdot x_i)| = \frac{|B(x_{i-1},x_i)|}{||s_\delta(x_{i-1})|_1| \cdot ||s_\delta(x_i)|_1|}$, we know that

$$1+\epsilon \geq \frac{1}{||s_\delta(x_{i-1})|_1| \cdot ||s_\delta(x_i)|_1|} > 1.$$

From an easy calculation using $0 \leq B(\delta, x_0) \leq 1$ and $|s_\delta(x_i)|_1 = |1-2B(\delta, x_i)|$,

$$\frac{\epsilon}{2(1+\epsilon)} \geq |B(x_i,\delta)| \text{ or } |B(x_i,\delta)| \geq \frac{2+\epsilon}{2(1+\epsilon)} \tag{5}$$

holds according to the sign of $1-2B(x_i,\delta)$.

Take $\epsilon = \frac{1}{k}$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Then for each k, we can choose $x_i(k)$ in $[\rho, \rho']$ satisfying above. Let $T = \max\{B(\delta, v) : v \in [\rho, \rho']\}$. Thus, for sufficiently large k, since $\frac{2+\epsilon}{2(1+\epsilon)} > T$, the latter case of (5) never happens.

On the other hand, for each sufficiently large k, let $y(k) \in [\rho, \rho']$ be the point attaining $\ell_B(\rho, y(k)) = \frac{1}{k}$. Since $\ell_B(\rho, y) = \ell_B(s_\delta \cdot \rho, s_\delta \cdot y(k))$, the above discussions for $\epsilon = \frac{1}{k}$ can be also applied for the interval $[\rho, y(k)]$, i.e., there exists $z(k)$ such that $\frac{\epsilon}{2(1+\epsilon)} \geq |B(z(k),\delta)|$ holds. This implies that $z(k)$ has an accumulation point in $H_{\delta,0} \cap \widehat{Q}$ as k tends to infinity. Hence $\rho \in H_{\delta,0} \cap \widehat{Q}$. Similarly, we also know that $\rho' \in H_{\delta,0} \cap \widehat{Q}$. Therefore, we obtain the required assertion. ▮

3. A proof of Theorem 1.2

The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 1.2.

Let (W,S) be a Coxeter system of rank 3 with $S = \{s_\alpha, s_\beta, s_\gamma\}$ and $\Delta = \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\}$ its simple system.

For the proof of Theorem 1.2, we divide two cases;

(a) $-1 \leq B(\alpha,\beta) \leq 0$, $-1 \leq B(\beta,\gamma) \leq 0$ and $-1 \leq B(\alpha,\gamma) \leq 0$.

(b) other cases, i.e., there are distinct δ and δ' in Δ such that $B(\delta,\delta') < -1$.

We note that both proofs are almost the same.

3.1. **The case of (a).** First, we concentrate on the case of the Coxeter group, where $(s_\alpha s_\beta)^m = 1, (s_\beta s_\gamma)^n = 1, (s_\alpha s_\gamma)^k = 1$ with $m,n,k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2} \cup \{\infty\}$ and $B(\delta,\delta') = -1$ if the order of $s_\delta s_{\delta'}$ is infinity, where $\delta, \delta' \in \Delta$.

We now come to the position to prove the case of Theorem 1.2 (a).

Proof of Theorem 1.2 (a). In the case of an infinite Coxeter group, the order of $s_\alpha s_\beta s_\gamma$ is infinite. (Consult, e.g., [4, Theorem 8.4].) Thus, for any simple root $\delta \in \Delta$, there exists a converging subsequence of $((s_\alpha s_\beta s_\gamma)^n \cdot \delta)_{n=1}^\infty$. Let ρ be one accumulation point of such subsequence and

$$\mathcal{R}_\rho = \overline{\{w \cdot \rho : w \in W\}} \subset E$$

the closure of a set of limit points. Proving $\mathcal{R}_\rho = \widehat{Q}$ leads us to the desired conclusion $E = \widehat{Q}$ since $\mathcal{R}_\rho \subset E \subset \widehat{Q}$.

First, we prove that there exist at least three points $\widetilde{\alpha}, \widetilde{\beta}, \widetilde{\gamma}$ in $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ satisfying the following three conditions:

$$\begin{cases} \widetilde{\alpha} \text{ is visible from both } \beta \text{ and } \gamma; \\ \widetilde{\beta} \text{ is visible from both } \gamma \text{ and } \alpha; \\ \widetilde{\gamma} \text{ is visible from both } \alpha \text{ and } \beta. \end{cases}$$

Let $\{\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3\} = \Delta$.

- When the order of $s_{\delta_1}s_{\delta_2}$ is infinite, we may set $\widetilde{\delta_3} = \lim_{n\to\infty}(s_{\delta_1}s_{\delta_2})^n \cdot \rho$. Then $\widetilde{\delta_3} \in \mathcal{R}_\rho$ and it is easy to check that $\widetilde{\delta_3}$ is visible from both δ_1 and δ_2.
- When the order of $s_{\delta_1}s_{\delta_2}$ is finite, say, $(s_\alpha s_\beta)^m = 1$ with $m < \infty$, the order of the parabolic subgroup W' generated by s_α and s_β is $2m$. Let V_α (resp. V_β) be the set of the points in $W' \cdot \rho$ which are visible from α (resp. β) but not visible from β (resp. α). Then V_α and V_β have the same cardinality n with $n \leq m$. Suppose that there does not exist $\widetilde{\gamma}$, i.e., $V_\alpha \cap V_\beta = \emptyset$. So we can write $V_\alpha = \{\rho_1, \dots, \rho_n\}$ and $V_\beta = \{\rho'_1, \dots, \rho'_n\}$. Observe that s_α and s_β act on each V_α and V_β as permutations $\sigma_\alpha, \sigma_\beta : \{1, \dots, n\} \longrightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}$ so that $s_\alpha \cdot V_\alpha = \{\rho'_{\sigma_\alpha(1)}, \dots, \rho'_{\sigma_\alpha(n)}\}$ and $s_\beta \cdot V_\beta = \{\rho_{\sigma_\beta(1)}, \dots, \rho_{\sigma_\beta(n)}\}$. In particular, we recognize that each image of the points in V_β by s_α must be visible from α and vice versa. Moreover, the permutation $\sigma_{\beta\alpha} := \sigma_\beta\sigma_\alpha$ has order n. As stated before, each B-reflection extends the length of visible arcs. So we see that

  $$\begin{aligned} d_B(\rho_i, \rho_j) &\leq d_B(\rho_{\sigma_{\beta\alpha}(i)}, \rho_{\sigma_{\beta\alpha}(j)}) \\ &\leq d_B(\rho_{\sigma^2_{\beta\alpha}(i)}, \rho_{\sigma^2_{\beta\alpha}(j)}) \\ &\leq \cdots \\ &\leq d_B(\rho_{\sigma^n_{\beta\alpha}(i)}, \rho_{\sigma^n_{\beta\alpha}(j)}) = d_B(\rho_i, \rho_j), \end{aligned}$$

  for any $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Thus all the equalities of these inequalities must be satisfied. By virtue of Lemma 2.5 (iii), it happens either that $\rho_i = \rho_j$ or that $\{\rho_i, \rho_j\} = \{s_\beta \cdot \rho_i, s_\beta \cdot \rho_j\}$ with $\rho_i \neq \rho_j$. The latter case forces that ρ_i or ρ_j belongs to $V_\alpha \cap V_\beta$, a contradiction. Thus each of V_α and V_β consists of one element. Let $V_\alpha = \{\rho_1\}$ and $V_\beta = \{\rho'_1\}$. Then four poitns α, ρ_1, ρ'_1 and β should lie in the same line. On the other hand, since W' is finite, $L(\alpha, \beta)$ does not intersect with $\widehat{Q}$, a contradiction. Hence $V_\alpha \cap V_\beta$ is not empty. This means that $\widetilde{\gamma}$ exists in $W' \cdot \rho$.

Next, we prove the desired assertion. We now suppose, on the contrary, that $\mathcal{R}_\rho \subsetneq \widehat{Q}$. That is to say, there exists an interval $[a_1, b_1]$ in $\widehat{Q}$ such that no element of $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ is contained in the open interval (a_1, b_1) but $a_1, b_1 \in \mathcal{R}_\rho$. Hence $[a_1, b_1] \subset [\widetilde{\alpha}, \widetilde{\beta}]$ or $[a_1, b_1] \subset [\widetilde{\beta}, \widetilde{\gamma}]$ or $[a_1, b_1] \subset [\widetilde{\gamma}, \widetilde{\alpha}]$ occurs.

Let, say, $[a_1, b_1] \subset [\widetilde{\alpha}, \widetilde{\beta}]$. Let $a_2 = s_\gamma \cdot a_1$ and $b_2 = s_\gamma \cdot b_1$. Then either $a_2 \in [\widetilde{\alpha}, \widetilde{\gamma}]$ or $a_2 \in [\widetilde{\beta}, \widetilde{\gamma}]$, and so is b_2. Moreover, if $\widetilde{\gamma} \in [a_2, b_2]$, then $s_\gamma \cdot \widetilde{\gamma} \in [a_1, b_1]$, a contradiction. Thus, $\widetilde{\gamma} \notin [a_2, b_2]$. In particular, $[a_2, b_2] \subset [\widetilde{\alpha}, \widetilde{\gamma}]$ or $[a_2, b_2] \subset [\widetilde{\beta}, \widetilde{\gamma}]$ occurs, say, $[a_2, b_2] \subset [\widetilde{\alpha}, \widetilde{\gamma}]$. From Lemma 2.5 (ii), we notice that $d_B(a_1, b_1) \leq d_B(a_2, b_2)$.

Similarly, for each $n \geq 1$, if $[a_n, b_n] \subset [\widetilde{\delta_1}, \widetilde{\delta_2}]$, then we set $a_{n+1} = s_{\delta_3} \cdot a_n$ and $b_{n+1} = s_{\delta_3} \cdot b_n$, where $\{\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3\} = \Delta$. Moreover, we also have $d_B(a_n, b_n) \leq d_B(a_{n+1}, b_{n+1})$. In addition, $[a_n, b_n] \cap \mathcal{R}_\rho = \{a_n, b_n\}$ and $(a_i, b_i) \cap (a_j, b_j) = \emptyset$ for all i and j with $i \neq j$. Now we have known that $(\widehat{Q}, d_B)$ is compact, in particular, $\widehat{Q}$ has a bounded ℓ_B length. Hence it should be satisfied that there exists a sufficiently large N such that

$$d_B(a_N, b_N) = d_B(a_{N+1}, b_{N+1}) = \cdots .$$

By Lemma 2.5 (iii), two situations $a_N = b_N$ and $\{a_N, b_N\} = \{a_{N+1}, b_{N+1}\}$ can happen. Since $d_B(a_N, b_N) = 0$ if $a_N = b_N$, this never happens. On the other hand, the condition $\{a_N, b_N\} = \{a_{N+1}, b_{N+1}\}$ implies that $\{a_N, b_N\} = H_{\delta,0} \cap \widehat{Q}$ for some $\delta \in \Delta$. Then it is clear that $s_\delta \cdot \widetilde{\delta}$ is contained in (a_N, b_N), also a contradiction.

Therefore, we conclude that $\mathcal{R}_\rho = \widehat{Q}$, as required. ∎

Here we emphasize that from this proof, we see that any base point ρ defines the same $\mathcal{R}_\rho = \widehat{Q}$. This fact proves Corollary 1.4.

3.2. **The case of (b).** We consider the case where there exist δ and δ' in Δ such that $B(\delta, \delta') < -1$. Then the parabolic subgroup generated by s_δ and $s_{\delta'}$ has exactly two accumulation points ([3, Example 2.1]). So there exists a component $D_{\delta\delta'} \subset \widehat{Q}$ intersecting with $\operatorname{conv}(\Delta)$ at two points. Let

$$\{D_1, \dots, D_m\} = \{D_{\delta\delta'} : \delta, \delta' \in \Delta, B(\delta, \delta') < -1\}$$

denote such connected components out of $\operatorname{conv}(\Delta)$, where $m \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. What we must show is

$$E = \widehat{Q} \setminus \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{m} W \cdot D_i \right).$$

Modifying slightly, we can prove this in the same manner as the case (a). Namely, when $B(\delta_1, \delta_2) < -1$ for $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in \Delta$, we use the end points $\widetilde{\delta_3^{(1)}}$ and $\widetilde{\delta_3^{(2)}}$ of the component $D_{\delta_1\delta_2}$ instead of $\widetilde{\delta_3}$. These $\widetilde{\delta_3^{(1)}}$ and $\widetilde{\delta_3^{(2)}}$ also belong to $\mathcal{R}_\rho$ for some accumulation point ρ. The rest of the proof are similar. ∎

4. TOWARDS THE CASES OF HIGHER RANKS

Finally, we discuss Theorem 1.2 for higher rank cases.

For a Coxeter group W of rank $n > 3$, in the case where B has the signature $(n-1, 1)$, some suitable generalization of our proof of Theorem 1.2 seems to show that Conjecture 1.1 is also true for W. For example, we need to extend the metric d_B for the higher rank cases, which is not a length metric but a Finsler metric.

On the other hand, our proof requires the convexity of $\{v \in V_1 : q(v) \leq 0\}$. This convexity comes from what the signature of B is $(n-1, 1)$. However, unfortunately, we have examples of B which are neither positive definite, positive semidefinite nor have the signature $(n-1, 1)$.

Example 4.1. Let W be a Coxeter group of rank 4 with its generating set $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_4\}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} &B(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = -a,\ B(\alpha_2, \alpha_3) = -b,\ B(\alpha_3, \alpha_4) = -c, \\ &B(\alpha_1, \alpha_3) = B(\alpha_1, \alpha_4) = B(\alpha_2, \alpha_4) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

with $a, b, c \in \{\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{k}\right) : k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>2}\} \cup [1, \infty)$. It then follows from an easy computation that the signature of B is $(2, 2)$ if and only if B is neither positive definite nor positive semidefinite, and three positive real numbers a, b, c satisfy $a^2 + b^2 + c^2 - a^2c^2 < 1$. (Consult, e.g., [4] for the classification of B of positive definite or positive semidefinite type.) For example, when $(a, b, c) = (2, \frac{1}{2}, 2)$, this condition is satisfied.

References

[1] Cédric Bonnafé and Matthew Dyer. *Semidirect product decomposition of Coxeter groups*, Comm. Algebra, 38(4):1549-1574, 2010. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00927870902980354.

[2] M. R. Bridson and A. Haefliger, *Metric Spaces of Non-Positive Curvature*. Grundlehren der math. Wiss. 319, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999.

[3] C.Hohlweg, J-P.Labbé, and Vivien Ripoll, *Asymptotical behaviour of roots of infinite Coxeter groups I*. Preprint arXiv:1112.5415

[4] James E. Humphreys. *Reflection groups and Coxeter groups*, volume 29 of Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990.

[5] Daan Krammer. *The conjugacy problem for Coxeter groups.* Groups Geom. Dyn., 3(1):71-171, 2009. http://dx.doi.org/10.4171/GGD/52.

Akihiro Higashitani, Department of Pure and Applied Mathematics, Graduate School of Information Science and Technology, Osaka University, Toyonaka, Osaka 560-0043, Japan

E-mail address: `a-higashitani@cr.math.sci.osaka-u.ac.jp`

Ryosuke Mineyama, Department of Mathematics, Graduate School of Science, Osaka University, Toyonaka, Osaka 560-0043, Japan

E-mail address: `r-mineyama@cr.math.sci.osaka-u.ac.jp`

Norihiro Nakashima, Department of Mathematics, Graduate School of Science, Hokkaido University, Sapporo, Hokkaido 060-0810, Japan

E-mail address: `naka_n@math.sci.hokudai.ac.jp`